UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,751	04/30/2001	Bernhard J. Scholz	GE1-004US	3458

21718	7590	12/21/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC
SUITE 500
421 W RIVERSIDE
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address --

Period f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 October 2004_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-42_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _7-18_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-6, and 19-42_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _30 April 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the response to restriction requirement filed on 10/20/2004.

This action is made Non-Final.

2.   In the response, claims 7-18 have been withdrawn without traverse (this is assumed, since Applicants did not indicated the type of election). Claims 1-6, and 19-42 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 19, 23, 32, and 38 are independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3.   Applicant's election of 1-6, and 19-42 in the response filed on 10/20/2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

7.   Claim 28 recites the limitation "the page" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent

basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "page" in this claim or its base

independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raz (Pat.#

6,292,827, 9/18/2001, filed on 6/20/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added to the

converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields—*identifying a field on a form*

and one or more restrictions and validation code, that when executed, validates that the input

conforms to the one or more restrictions (col.12, lines 36-49). In other words, the paper form is

converted to HTML. Validation functions are identified and then added to the fields in the

HTML form—*adding to a form definition that includes the field, the identified validation code.*

Regarding independent claim 19, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added to the

converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields—*identifying one or more*

desired fields and automatically adding validation code to source code of the form (col.12, lines

36-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
> a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 2-6, 20-24, and 26-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Raz, in view of Laura Lemay's Workshop JavaScript, Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay,

1996, Sams.net, pp.132-137.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions—*validation*

code that causes the other processor to execute the identified validation code --are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *adding to the form definition, a reference to the identified validation code.*

However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms using a function call, such

as "function Validate ()" page 134, line 3-- *reference to the added validation code.* The

validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the

validation reference to the converted form of Raz with well-known HTML function calls taught

by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback

without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and

trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions—*pre-defined

validation code* are added to the HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields

(col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *the form that defines a field includes a tag corresponding to the field.*

However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions

are added within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the validation reference to

the converted form of Raz with well-known HTML function calls taught by Lemay, because

Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait

on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting

the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms, having fields, such as an account field, for typing—*user input--*

an account number (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields—*identifying, from a*

plurality of pieces of validation code, the validation code corresponding to the one or more

attributes of the custom tag (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying a*

custom tag corresponding to the field, wherein the custom tag includes an indication of one or

more attributes and wherein each of the one or more attributes includes a value indicating what

input corresponding to the field is to be restricted to. However, Lemay teaches adding

validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and

the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded

(page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to include the validation functions of Raz within tags of Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *a custom tag corresponding to each of the one or more desired fields, wherein each custom tag has on e or more validation attributes and wherein each validation attribute includes an indication of the attribute and a corresponding value that input corresponding to the custom tag is to be restricted to.* However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the validation functions of Raz within tags of Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input by a user into those fields (col.12, lines

36-49).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 19, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms—*generating a temporary form definition*. During the automatic

conversion, validation functions are added to the converted form fields for verifying the data

input into those fields–*adding and executing code to add the identified validation code to the*

new form definition and outputting, as the source code, the temporary form definition (col.12,

lines 36-49).

Regarding independent claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the HTML form

fields for verifying the data input into those fields —*further to add to a form definition, for each*

of the one or more custom tags, validation code to validate subsequent inputs to a field (col.12,

lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *one or more custom tags associated with a form;*

and replace each of the one or more custom tags with another tag, and field corresponding to the

tag. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation

functions are added within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as

"ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the

validation functions into the HTML form of Raz within tags as suggested by Lemay, because

Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait

on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting

the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input by a user into those fields (col.12, lines

36-49).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *a custom tag is a HTML tag*. However, Lemay teaches adding validation

functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133,

lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to replace the tags of the converted form of Raz with well-known HTML tags

suggested by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate

feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save

time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—

custom tags.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *add a reference to the added validation code.* However, Lemay teaches

adding validation functions to HTML forms using a function call, such as "function Validate ()"

page 134, line 3-- *reference to the added validation code.* The validation functions are added

within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the validation reference to the

converted form of Raz with well-known HTML function calls taught by Lemay, because Lemay

teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a

server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the

Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms—*generate a new document corresponding to the page.* After

converting the forms, validation functions are added to the HTML form fields for verifying the

data input into those fields-- *add validation code to the new document* (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz

fails to explicitly disclose: *to replace each of the one or more custom tags with another tag by*

adding the other tag to the new document. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions

to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page

18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to add the validation code to the newly converted form of Raz within well-known

HTML tags taught by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving

immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a

user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created

HTML tags.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields—*restrictions corresponding to*

the same validation code, add the same validation code only once (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails

to explicitly disclose: *one or more custom tags*. However, Lemay teaches adding validation

functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133,

lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to add the validation code to the newly converted form of Raz within well-

known HTML tags taught by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving

immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a

user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created

HTML tags.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields. The data, including validation

functions, are stored in a RDBMS database—*tag library* (col. 9, lines 27-45, col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 30, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields. The data, including validation

functions, are stored in a RDBMS database—*tag library* (col. 9, lines 27-45, col.12, lines 36-49).

Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *an identification of the one or more custom tags.* However,

Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added

within HTML tags--*identification* (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Raz, and Lemay to store

the well-known HTML tags taught by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and

receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus,

allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the

created HTML tags.

Regarding independent claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML forms—*form definition*(col.12, lines 36-49).

Moreover, Raz teaches that after converting the forms, validation functions are added to

the HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields — *identifying and adding*

validation code that, when executed based on an input corresponding to the field, *validates*

whether the associated restrictions are satisfied (col.12, lines 36-49). In other words there are

validation functions associated—*one or more associated input restrictions* with the HTML form

fields, which are to be added to the form. Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *identifying a*

replacement non-custom tag, adding the identified replacement non-custom tag to a new form

definition. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms along with

tags— *identifying and adding a replacement non-custom tag.* The validation functions are added

within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length

value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added the validation tags of Lemay

and functions to the form fields of Raz, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and

receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus,

allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the

created HTML tags—*custom tags.*

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *adding to the new form definition, a reference to invoke the added validation*

code. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms using a function

call, such as "function Validate ()" page 134, line 3-- *reference to the added validation code.* The

validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the

validation reference to the converted form of Raz with well-known HTML function calls taught

by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback

without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and

trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches that after converting the

forms—*receiving* HTML *form definition*, validation functions are added to the HTML form

fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly

disclose: *adding the each of the non-custom tags to the new form definition*. However, Lemay

teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms along with tags— *identifying and adding a*

replacement non-custom tag. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the

functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page

133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have added the validation tags of Lemay and functions to the form fields

of Raz, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without

having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble

by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input by a user into those fields (col.12, lines

36-49).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49).

Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *each input custom tag includes one or more attributes that identify the one or more associated restrictions, and wherein each of the one or more attributes includes an indication of the attribute and a corresponding value for that data input corresponding to the tag is to be restricted to.* However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the validation functions of Raz within attributes of Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields–*execution code to add the identified validation code to the new form definition* (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding independent claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms, having fields for entering data. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the HTML form fields—*a first portion identifying an input field--* for verifying the data input into those fields — *a second portion identifying validation code to be added to a page to enforce the one or more restrictions* (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 39, which depends on claim 30, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms—*text markup language document*. After converting the forms,

validation functions are added to the HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those

fields (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 40, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms, having fields, such as an account field, for typing an account

number (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49).

Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *one or more attributes and for each attribute and associated*

value for the attribute. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms.

The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute,

such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

include the validation functions of Raz within attributes of Lemay, because Lemay teaches the

saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page

132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript

validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms, having fields, such as an account field, for typing—*user input*—an account number (col.12, lines 36-49).

12.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Lemay, and further in view of Kryka et al, hereinafter Kryka (US Pat.# 6,832,369 B1, 12/14/2004, filed on 8/1/2000).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 23, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *the system comprises a compiler.* However, Kryka teaches a Java compiler for compiling source code into Java bytecode form (col.1, lines 54-68). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a compiler, because Kryka teaches above the popular use of a platform-independent programming language--Java. Thus, allowing a user to easily implement the form across multiple computer platforms.

Conclusion

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shaughnessy et al. (Pat. # 2004/0205644), Nelson et al. (Pat. # 5,999,948),

Alexander (Pat. # 6,732,331), Kiefer (Pat. # 2003/0033448), Wagner (Pat. # 2003/0233296),

Duane et al. (Pat. # 6,243,721), and Loiacono (Pat. # 6,175,841).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2148**. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (every other Friday off) from 8:00

a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least

one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

> Commissioner for Patents
> P.O. Box 1450
> Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)**

CESAR B PAULA
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178

12/16/04